No 4046.227

GIVEN BY
Herbert C. Peabody.

Penalt[illegible]
[illegible]s of the Commo[illegible]th of
[illegible]etts, Chapter 208, Section 83.

[illegible]48

The Church Service and Its Music

HERBERT C. PEABODY

Organist, Christ Church
Fitchburg, Massachusetts

H046.227

Written for the Conference, Summer School of Church Music, Wellesley College
26 June 1919

Herbert C. Peabody

HARWICH, Nov. 28—Funeral services for Herbert C. Peabody, 79, prominent composer, choir director and organist, and dean emeritus of the American Guild of Organists, will be held Tuesday at 1:30 p. m. in the Congregational Church, Harwich Center.

Organist and choir master in several Greater Boston Episcopal Churches, he died Friday at the home of his daughter, Adelyn J. Peabody on Parellel st.

Also surviving are his wife, Esther R.; two other daughters, Mrs. Ruth M. Boynton of Mt. Vernon, N. Y. and Mrs. Monroe Carlton of Bath, Me., and a son, Frederic of Oshkosh, Wis.

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY

The Church Service and Its Music

HERBERT C. PEABODY

Organist, Christ Church
Fitchburg, Massachusetts

H046.227

Written for the Conference, Summer School of Church Music, Wellesley College
26 June 1919

I herewith make acknowledgment of quotations from articles of mine in *The Churchman* and *Living Church*, also from my article on "The Organist and the Church Service," all copyrighted.

H. C. P.

Herbert C. Peabody
Apr. 22. 1920

Copyright, 1919, by Herbert C. Peabody.

The Church Service and Its Music

TO GET down to the concrete at once: We are dealing with two kinds of music — music as music, commodity, entity; and music as influence, atmosphere, interpretation—atmosphere in which the church service nestles and reaches out in all comfort to effect its spiritual impress among those who come in contact with it. We are also dealing with the contention so vigorously made just at present that chancel music has proved itself an abomination, and for this reason should be cast out as the intruder and impostor, church music to be limited to congregational hymns and chants.

My title, as on our programme and for which I accept responsibility, is "Place of Music in the Church Service." I'd like to alter it. One might infer from it that we make holes in the service in which to place music, the service as bouquet-holder, music as substance, entertainment. It is just such music as this that has made such havoc of our subject. The kind is so prevalent that all chancel music is considered abominable. I'd like the title to read, "In Place of Music in the Church Service." And "In Place of Music"—what? Service! Service in the sense of serving, of advantageous use. We should not have music in the service any more than we should have a clergyman or an organist. We bring on troubles when we place music or tack it on. We place a book, or we place responsibility; we don't place church music. Better for our title to read, "Use and Value of Music in the Church Service." Still better, in the concrete, "Service Music."

As I have said, there are two kinds of so-called church music. Both of them are entirely respectable in their own fields of usefulness. We find both in religious services, but only one of them, however, can qualify in religious service. The other has crept into religious services, but it has raised mischief therein

because it is the foreign substance, thus arousing criticism and disapproval of all chancel music, and thus affecting the other and innocent and invaluable kind.

One thing to do, as a result, is to eliminate all chancel music from the service, as is advocated by people who have suddenly discovered that music is the arch-enemy of public worship. We hear of "the hungry maws of choirs," of "pagans on the organ bench," of "hirelings," of "worship bought with cash," of "worship by proxy," etc., expressions which are both vehement and caustic, and expressions which have appeared in public print—indicating an aggravated situation. I immediately grant that chancel music has fallen into abuse and that correction is both needed and coming, but if I succeed with this paper I shall widely separate correction and extermination. And if I succeed, you will be thinking, when I close, of the church service—not of me, nor of music, nor of this paper; I shall establish in this room a reverence for the church service and its music, service and music knit together in an atmosphere of reverence which you will be able to recognize. I may not succeed in my effort, yet even the topic of real chancel music can affect the atmosphere in this room.

Another and more practical thing to do, in correction, is to locate responsibility for the misuse of music and to strive toward higher education among those who control music and among those who employ it in the service. Personally I should regard the loss of chancel music as a distinct loss to the service. I have had more or less experience, and I have been charged by contemporaries as championing the service at the expense of its music. The music of my ideal, however, is so great that it is absorbed and lost in the service, and I like to respect music in terms of service. To illustrate: You hear a brass band, instruments of brass, playing "My country, 'tis of thee!" What does it convey to your minds—music? A composition in music? No, the tune is so genuine that it is absorbed in its text, in emphasis of it. And I think you are already arriving at my definition of chancel music, sharing my appreciation of a sublime influence in religious life and living. Many there are who know

that emotion and intellect are in positive relationship, but few there are who would venture to point out the dividing line.

My topic, in the concrete, is Service Music—service first. If music, actively in service, is to be applied to the church service we must make the service in such application our study. We can study music of the service only in its relationship to the service—by studying the service itself and the effect produced by such application. We study music from a position in the service, music coming towards us, studying the effect it has upon the service, receiving; we should not study music from the outside, giving. The service receives music; we do not give it. Loam is applied to a plant, but our interest concentrates upon the plant and upon the effect produced by the loam. The dealer in loam may have no knowledge of our plant and may not know the kind of loam our plant needs. We should know our plant, obtain the right kind of loam—and apply it. And so I like to respect music in terms of service, not as the menial but glorifying; not in what music is, but in what it can accomplish. I like to deal in loam, but as the gardener, not as the merchant. I like to use music, rather than to give it. I like to deal in results which music can produce; music as result and effect, rather than as commodity. And when both chancel and nave are educated to the point of discrimination and application and appreciation we shall have put an end to this advocacy of extermination. Something is manifestly wrong when chancel music can be seen and heard, when it deteriorates even to this advocacy of extermination, but we lack an appreciation of music's value to the service and we evince a lack of faith in education if we share in advocacy of extermination as the only possible means of correction.

Dr. Samuel Eliot has defined education as the process of changing sight into insight. I am entirely confident that a larger understanding of the church service will regulate its component elements, that the service may be the harmonious unit. Psychology is taking charge of the service—and psychology is a veritable Sherlock Holmes in searching out irrelevant elements in the service. And psychology tells us that music is

needed, particularly in the liturgical service; psychology is impatient with those who would deprive the service of its music. The trouble is, we are judging music from sight, rather than from insight. Music has been mishandled, and in such abuse it protrudes in the service—and in such abnormal form it is judged as chancel music. Common sense tells us to educate ourselves as well as those who handle service music, that such music may be released from human handicap, freed to exert its spiritual influence as directed by psychology. Physical music can be destroyed, but service music will still live. Music will express the soul's yearnings and aspirations as long as there is a soul to yearn and to aspire. We can remove such music from the church service, grief and grievous as this would be to the service, but this music would still live—to serve. Such music, in its natural purity, is beyond our understanding, and it is only when we try to mould and shape music for ulterior purposes that we reduce its power. A pity to charge music with our own shortcomings.

During this wave of criticism of chancel music we must realize that this inappropriate kind of music crept in because of our inability to discriminate, and we should realize that we are showing the same inability now when we class all chancel music alike and pronounce it objectionable. Do let us be at least modest in such pronouncement, certain as we can be that when proper correction is accomplished we shall still find music in religious service. Music in such service has survived the ages; we should not be the ones to judge and condemn. If we do not know that the very soul's inexpressible has found outlet through music since the world began, let us avoid self-assertion. Someone has said, "Music is the expression of feeling; as words are of ideas." There we have expression of the inexpressible; music the delicate, sensitive, and infinite medium, one of several, through which man expresses his thought in innate intimacy with God. Someone else has said, "Music is God's best gift to man; the only art of heaven given to earth, and the only art of earth which we can take to heaven." How unjust and inaccurate, this house-top criticism of such a friend of the re-

ligious service in public worship! Do let us learn to discriminate and separate, that we may refute unjust charge and protect our co-worker from those who would malign and harm it. Certain it is that in such protection we are protecting the church service against loss. We can learn to separate; we can even remove weeds and destroy parasites, yet cherish and nourish the root of one of the loveliest flowers in our garden of service elements. I earnestly plead with you toward appreciation, that service music may be released purified and that the religious service may be not at the mercy of those who know music only as music, who know nothing of music as influence and interpretation.

One kind of music used in religious services is objective music; something for the ear, entertainment. The other and true kind is subjective music as influence, as devout atmosphere, as a mediator in religious thought and its expression. This subject immediately resolves itself into one of contribution. Music as contribution is service; it is not of itself. As contribution, music submits, submerges itself. As entertainment, music is positive, definite, an end in itself; we listen to it as we would to a speaker. There illustrated are the two kinds. One is infinite, Greek to these critics of music in bulk; the other should not be employed in the religious service. While we are in definition, let me make a distinction between the speaker and the teacher. The speaker may be only the speaker; the voice, the individual. The teacher teaches; he creates response, reaction. Teaching is creative, and therefore is of its group environment. We hear of the clergyman who is a "good preacher," but in truth he is of infinitely greater value to his religious service if he is the successful teacher. The church service teaches; why should not its vital elements contribute toward that most desirable end?

A great deal of our chancel music simply speaks; it is of itself; but I plead that there is music which religiously teaches, and I look to the day when intelligence will govern chancel music generally, to dumfound criticism such as we now hear. Let me emphasize: *Service music obscures its identity as music in its all-important aspect as service.* Music which under mis-

handling does not attain, which is not service, and which remains physical music, is the kind which these present-day critics can comprehend. Such music has not attained; hence, to them, all chancel music is an abomination. In our mishandling of music, service music has in many cases become music as music, professional entertainment, something for the senses; and now that results of our error are becoming manifest we jump on music as the offender.

If we regard service music as anything but contribution we transform it into a something else, of far less value to our purpose, and leading to disaster; we transform it into a physical commodity, in which tangible form it can be recognized and criticized by the man who judges furniture and apples, world politics and service music. To him, service music is a commodity which can be bought with cash. He is of those who have bought music for the service with cash. It has proved a poor investment—and now all chancel music must be swept out. The panacea for all the ills of the service has been found — and applied! And the pity of it is that real service music, unostentatiously and reverently serving the hour of worship, would equally be the outcast.

We must defend service music from such indiscriminate and unintelligent criticism. And in such defence we are in reality defending the church service in its composite structure. We must enter into a campaign of education, that our people may be able to differentiate between music as music, and music as influence, in the religious service. There is a difference, and if we learn to determine it we shall also be able to determine the difference existing between correction and extermination.

You well know that contribution is service, and that neither contribution nor service is of itself. You well know, too, that the church service, not standing of nor for itself, is ordained to accomplish a mission. Assuredly, all elements, all component parts, of that service must be both subservient and contributory—including the clergyman and organist. An element is a part of something larger than itself. If an element of the church service insists upon protruding itself it forms an identity of its

own and becomes the counter-attraction, thus harming the service. In many, many cases we have given music, as an integral part of the service, over into the hands of those who understand music only as music, the inadequate kind of professional musician, and in such hands it has become separated from the service, thus laying ourselves open to the charge that we are incapable of making an adequate selection of participants or of defining service music, either in identity or in purpose. Service music is gentle and innocent, and yet tremendously powerful and effective in serving the purpose for which the church service exists. It is easily misunderstood, and it is easily mishandled. It is the topic for the expert, for the psychologist; not for the professional musician whose definition of music agrees with that of these critics, nor is it a topic for the clergyman who has been denied training in it. I do not plead that the clergyman should be able to sing or to play a musical instrument, fortunate as such accomplishment is, but I do plead that the psychology of service music, appreciation, should be of the divinity school curriculum. I recall a tale told years ago by Dr. Peabody of Groton, concerning a boy about to enter Groton School. During the preliminary interview the father asked Dr. Peabody if the school employed a psychologist. It was a new topic in those days. The reply, of course, was in the negative, Dr. Peabody wondering just what use could be made of psychology in a school for boys, metaphysics and young boys a strange mixture. The parent then explained that this expert studies each individual boy, studies his life, his habits, his peculiarities; determines the boy's natural bent, discovers his talent, and fastens upon a course of study which will be certain to develop and further the boy's natural inclinations toward making the utmost of the material supplied.

Metaphysics and the church service, too, may at first seem quite a mixture, but we immediately sense the relationship when we know that psychology is that branch of metaphysics which deals with the human soul. And we are learning that music is psychology applied to the religious service. We have used music in bulk, and now realizing our mistake we accept the

teachings of psychology, to be governed by it. Our unappreciative critics, desiring to utterly deprive the service of chancel music! Music is going one way, these critics the other, and as long as music is within the jurisdiction and control of psychology it will win against all opposition. How essential, therefore, that the clergyman should be versed in this psychology of music. We place him in charge of the service—a service abundant with music—music which may make or break the service, and music about which the clergyman may know but little. A canon gives him the responsibility and authority to "suppress unseemly music," but he is denied his qualifications. The clergyman isn't in charge of the service if he isn't in charge of its music. He should be best qualified and fitted to know what his music can accomplish, and he should be free to exert it. The church organist is to be on a far higher plane than at present, and the clergyman will lean more or less upon this expert assistant, but he should be intelligently appreciative himself. Without a knowledge of the psychology of public worship as interpreted by music he is greatly handicapped. Minus such knowledge and equipment he stands apart while music is employed in the service by those who do not understand the service as he should understand it. Music is given the clergyman as an aid in his ministrations—*we can interpret service music in no other way*—and if he is apart from it then is there not only a lack of cohesion and sympathy, but an imperative need of check, as well. One method of check is to eradicate music, but in so doing we would do infinite harm to the service. Another and more logical method is to prepare the clergyman for his responsibility, plus an adequate education for the adequate organist. If the clergyman were versed in an appreciation of service music he could circumscribe and control. Minus such training, music drifts away from him and from its true form and purpose. He sees his music becoming an irritant, professionalism setting up itself in his service, the congregation unable to differentiate—and he joins with those who despair and who regard chancel music as an offender. If the clergyman doesn't understand the psychology of music he may not under-

stand the co-related psychology of the service—and the service may become the recitation; professional, physical music demanded by the congregation as a means of brightening the service. This gives the professional musician, him whose music is first, his opportunity, there is plenty of money forthcoming to pay the bills—and we are off on a tangent which inevitably leads to disaster and humiliation. Understand me, we need professional musicians in the service, but only those whose music can subordinately qualify as interpretation. The assertion is made that academic study of physical music and its diploma qualify the organ student as a "competent church organist," but the error of such assertion is self-evident. Our critics thrive on such definition of the church organist. Already, however, the Church itself is active in furthering correction in this particular. A very large and influential church in this country is standing sponsor for a positive school for church organists. In that school the promising student is educated abundantly, almost severely, in fundamentals pertaining to his instrument and choral rendition, but in addition to this, and above it, is an extensive training in the service and its psychology—and the graduate of that school is something more than a performer on a musical instrument, his music and himself a means and not an end. I hold no brief for that school; I simply place it in evidence as prophecy of the coming of higher education and standards among church organists, as evidence that the Church has a work for its organists and that it is beginning to use its own influence and to exert itself toward lifting the church organist to the elevation where he belongs and where he can qualify in exalted vocation. The Church makes reply to our advocates of extermination!

Limiting service music to congregational hymns and chants is far less than a compromise. We attend the church service to give, worshipfully, and to receive, reverently. Bear that in mind. To worshipers the service means more than personal participation. That is why we consecrate our church edifices, why even the architecture is impulse. In these days of stress and strife the House of God becomes a haven of solace and en-

couragement, a place of refuge. People like to attend services in some certain church because that church is "different." Its atmosphere is warm and wholesome, and its inspiration is unmistakably uplift and comfort; a pattern for others. We can depend on it that in that church the architecture is harmonious, that clergy, choir, music—everything, has submerged and forgotten self in the successful effort made to create devotional atmosphere in ensemble. You and I could not possibly conceive of foreign music in such atmosphere. Indeed, we may know that there the chancel music is credited with its share of accomplishment. The organist there is the psychologist ably assisting his clergyman. Bear in mind that this organist has not only obliterated himself and a large musical instrument, but he has also hidden from sight a conspicuous group of singers. If this were not so, the congregation would be conscious of music apart and of people stationed in the chancel in vestments. We may know, too, that clergy and congregation there would not view with complacency the entry of our critics to decry this music as an abomination, nor would they agree that service music consists exclusively of congregational hymns and chants! We hear of small churches longing for good music, and we hear of large urban churches wishing for "good" music; *i. e.*, congregational hymns and chants—which the small churches already have. No, we are floundering around on boggy footing, and we shall not reach solid ground until we learn to separate and to elevate. There must be some inherent value and potency in music, else it could not do that which it can do so effectively. The liturgical service is based on form and structure, sometimes rigidly, sometimes perpendicularly. Herein music aids; service music of the right type being able, if accurately used, to contribute warmth and elasticity—even vitality. The application of this psychology to the service is too delicate a task for the person or persons untrained in such application.

A fallacy, that all would be well if church music were limited to congregational hymns and chants. There again we should be accepting music in bulk. Most of us know that there are hymn-tunes and hymn-tunes, just as there are chants and

chants. A hymn-tune which is regarded at St. John's as helpful and inspiring may be considered at St. Luke's as a blot on the Hymnal, both opinions honest. We return, you see, to the clergyman. If he is of a quiet, dignified nature, for example, his hymn-tunes are of that nature, St. John's service of that nature. If he is bright and happy, radiating sunshine, the hymn-tunes at St. Luke's would be considered frivolous at St. John's. If the service at St. Mark's is perfunctory the hymn singing is listless, and hymns are chosen the music of which appeals to the human ear. In the warm service we feel like singing. Music seems a part of the air itself. We naturally voice it, we simply set it in motion. The best tunes are those so great that they lose themselves in their texts. The best hymn singing is that which is a spontaneous reflection of service atmosphere. Atmosphere must be right for the hymn, as a setting. Then the hymn fits and emphasizes the line of unit continuity. Impulsion will win the day every time against the Order of Service compulsion. Happy the service, ringing true, in which the congregation feels like singing. Hearty congregational singing is result, reflection. It results when the pew is fed upon inspiration until it cannot help singing. Placing the number of a hymn on the hymn-board doesn't produce hymn singing. You sing a hymn heartily because your mother sang and loved it; that's result, association. You sing a hymn heartily because it was a favorite years ago in the inspiring service at dear old St. James'; that's reflection. You sing heartily in the service because the service is warm inspiration. And when you are singing heartily it even may be that you are not really aware of the words you are singing; you are expressing feeling; you are but reflecting service inspiration. And we have returned to our subject; to chancel inspiration, to service atmosphere and the means by which to create it.

There is the psychology of the service, the psychology of its music, even the "new" psychology of silence. Silence, the art of listening and hearing, has its use in the service, thanks to psychology. Psychology circumscribes for it — and if silence should get away from psychology our critics of self appoint-

ment would be able to sense it, along with run-away music, immediately condemning Silence! I recall a curate, a dear, good fellow and conscientious to the last ditch, who had read somewhere that silence is efficacious, and I recall the early communion service in which he experimented with it. Silence came in square-cornered blocks, awkwardly and painfully. Poor fellow, there is silence as psychology, and there is silence as mathematics and delay. The clergyman has many things to learn and in which to be proficient. We should not be satisfied if he were simply the elocutionist. No, and we should not expect results from an organist who is simply the player on a musical instrument. In either case it is disrespect, if not irreverence.

Psychology is in charge of the service and its message, both spoken and sung. We find it governing even in matters of detail. For example, it tells us to stop perhaps at the fourth stanza of a hymn, even though the poem tells us to sing three more stanzas. It tells us if the service is too long or the sermon too short. The service loses in power if many pews are vacant—that's psychology; it gains in power if every seat is filled, to create a "push" against the chancel which thrills the chancel in inspiration and rebounds to reflect inspiration in the nave, thus creating united praise and prayer, which in turn creates an atmosphere truly compelling in its uplifting influence. No sermon, no music; a large body of people alive in spiritual atmosphere. That's psychology. And the service needs the inspirational leadership, said and sung, which the chancel supplies. Forgive my impatience with those who criticize the church service in terms of furniture or music or the cut of clerical vesture. Forgive my impatience even with the chancel which cannot climb above the physical nor submerge itself in an ensemble of religious devotion. There is no sermon or liturgy; there is no music, as such, in the true service of spiritual atmosphere. If one protrudes we have no ensemble, no harmonious unit. The pew must not be conscious of structural elements. These elements must be so great that they are capable of losing themselves in the unit of greatness. If an element is great it contributes; if weak it smashes the unit. Verily, a cold

draught through the church or a crying baby in the back pew —and the unit is in bits. All elements in the service must be contributory, and they must of necessity form the unit in action, that stimulating quantity in public worship which is so vital. There is no room in a church service for the individualistic, for the personal pronoun, for selfishness, for counter-attraction; each element must be both contributory and subordinate. A service deprived of its atmosphere and its unit by foreign substance injected is deprived of its virility. It is as the tree deprived of its sap. If the pew is in contact with atmosphere it means that the service is fulfilling its obligation of self forgotten, the chancel hidden from itself. Surely, by this time you can see how far away I am from music as music, and how I like to respect music in terms of service. The abuse and misuse of music but emphasize its potentialities. The need of educating both chancel and nave to an understanding of music and its psychology is most urgent. Until such education is accomplished we shall continue to have secular music in the chancel and individualism in the sung portions of the service. And, too, we shall continue to hear the song of these critics. Education is what we need, not the extermination of music.

An illustration or two may not be amiss. Psychology warns us concerning the Te Deum — a warning to which the last General Convention listened. It tells us that the Te Deum, our greatest hymn of praise, is too great to be absorbed so early in Morning Prayer. Psychology is too delicate to maintain control through its twenty-nine verses, music unable to cope witih its physical task. Music breaks, psychologically, under its load —and our critics arrive to declare music an offender. But our precious guide tells us that the Te Deum, great in all its effulgence and majesty, should be sung only near the close of a great triumphant service, the service behind it in support, the Te Deum the climax of the service in action, as in the festival services of our Massachusetts Choir Guild. The average parish choir attempting "befitting" music, or the Te Deum set to "simple" music—both are incongruous. Far better to read the Te Deum than to make it a physical struggle or attempt em-

phasis of it by the use of anæmic music. At best, the Te Deum in such common use, with little "preparation" so early in the service, is liable to entail a loss of effort and lapse into a test of endurance. And as a test of endurance it is far beyond the point where psychology controls. I would not advocate a congregational hymn as a substitute. A canticle, smaller than the Te Deum and larger than a congregational hymn as applied to service structure, would be more effective than a hymn in establishing a lifted and rising plane for the service which follows.

Again, psychology tells us that we err, while in the spiritual atmosphere of religious devotion, in providing a pause during which the physical ushers walk the aisles collecting the offering, thus bringing our minds back to physical things. I dislike to place this illustration before you because of the danger that the constructive will be mistaken as irreverence, nor have I yet established it in association with music of the service. I have discussed this problem with clergymen, all of them sharing my respect, of course, for the altruistic motive, yet all agreeing that this offering does not reach its intent. In Utopia this offering is an offering, entirely a religious act, but here it is generally regarded as a collection, our minds reverting to our pocketbooks, our bags and purses and loose change. Perhaps the act has wandered from its intent, but somehow, difficulty is experienced in associating worship with money, with legal tender. A saintly clergyman once showed me the plates after a service, sadly questioning the amount of money thereon as a bona fide thank offering. Apropos of this item, could we not abandon with profit the custom of making announcement of weekday activities while we are in a service of worship—announcement of cake sales and other perfectly legitimate forms of raising money? Is there not someone in the congregation who will relieve the rector both of this onerous announcement and of the expense of a weekly parish leaflet? And do you realize that the sermon hymn, following immediately upon this weekday announcement, has the task of bringing our minds back from cake sales to the service and preparing us for the sermon? (I wonder at this point in my paper if you are not conscious of service atmos-

phere, and if I do not jar by making this reference to it. If so, will you not concede that the cake sale announcements and ushers walking the aisles constitute a diversion of mind and a loss to the service?)

An analysis of the offertory anthem reveals a lack of faith in the efficacy of the offering as an act of worship. If you will think a moment you will realize that at this point in the service, music is liable, more than anywhere else, to become music as entertainment—music as diversion while the service halts and the ushers are busy. Would you countenance such physical activity and mental confusion in the nave during praise or prayer said instead of sung? Do we not frankly admit to organists and to the service that by such employment of an anthem we ourselves are using music for ulterior purpose? This anthem should never be allowed to slump into entertainment. To the contrary, it has the almost hopeless task of carrying the sermon across this pause and delivering it at the close of the service. See the need and desirability of continuity and harmony. We should know that subsequent complimentary reference to the sermon is also indirectly complimentary to the offertory anthem. If this anthem is right, it is lost in the line of continuity, carrying it along. If the anthem is wrong, it is physical, and physically good or bad it distracts, if not detracts, from the sermon gone before. Such is the unit which the true service forms.

We can comprehend physical relationships, but we get into a deeper topic when we deal with the psychology of music in its application to the religious service. There we are concerned with what to do; here we analyze the substance to determine just which element to use, just how we should use it, and just what result we may expect from such application. To tie up music in one bundle and throw it out of the church window or give it to those whose interests are limited to physical music, means that as judges we scarcely can qualify. The intricacies of psychology as applied to service music automatically disclose the hopelessness of critics who judge of church music as commodity. One might as well swallow the entire apothecary shop

and then denounce the shop for not having cured one's ailment.

There is no melting pot for service music. The psychologist of service music is the physician; sifting and sorting, prescribing and then applying, the stimulus not for music, but for the church service. We may be able to recognize both faults and lamentable results and yet be unequal to prescription and cure. Music is as invisible, as incomprehensible, as the service atmosphere of which it is a part. It is far too complex in nature and application to be treated by the long-distance critic. The more we try to shape and restrict it the more mechanical and impotent it becomes; but the more we release it from human handicap, in the direction of its natural purity and value, the more it can and will do for us. The sweet little kitten doesn't purr to hear itself purr; by it the kitten is expressing something; it is a reflection of kitten comfort. The sweet bird in the tree doesn't sing to hear itself sing; the song is a part of the lovely summer and its foliage — for us. Our professional musician must be one who looks up to his music in respect, and whose music looks up to the service, both of them serving. Psychology demands nothing less. We train a young man to play a musical instrument and then expect him to be able to assist in influencing a congregation in things spiritual—and when we wake up we shall realize that we ourselves are at fault and that we have given the young man too large a task. We have dwelt comfortably under the misapprehension that physical study on a musical instrument qualifies the young organist for participation in service interpretation. It is a prevalent notion, of which the young organist is but the victim. This young organist, fresh from physical study, may have had but elementary schooling before taking up the study of music. He blossoms forth as a *church organist*—and we cannot wonder that the college and seminary-trained clergyman balks at having the instrumentalist of mediocre education as his associate in the delicate task of influencing a congregation in things spiritual. The young organist knows nothing comprehensively of the church service, nor does he know anything about the psychology of public worship —and we wonder at results. We wonder that religious expres-

sion does not express religion. The church organist is in the service to *use* his music, not to sing or play it. He is no more apart from the service than is the Symphony player apart from the orchestra, and in these latter days there is just as much demand that our church music should be of the service as there is that the Symphony player should be of the orchestral ensemble. The difference is that the obstructionist in the orchestra would be removed; it would not suffice that he could play his musical instrument creditably. And this difference has in part created the unfortunate situation we are now facing. Behind it, however, are our own limitations, and when we elevate our demands we shall find that the supply has been lifted to meet them. We must educate our organists in the psychology of public worship, and we must help them, through education, to a realization that in the church service there is no room for a musical instrument, nor for organist or choir, who would be seen of men. Music cannot succeed or serve its purpose if organist and choir get up in front of it. Their music cannot be true to itself nor to them if they do not respect it in humbleness of mind and if they cannot release it in respect toward the service which it exists to serve. In truth, the coming organist is he whom the clergyman consults in psychology, his music off in the background simply as a supply depot.

I plead again that the clergyman, logically the leader, should be given larger equipment. Not that he is lacking now, but that he could accomplish so much more. We are to lift the service to a higher elevation, and in so doing we must look to the regulation and strength of its elements. The clergyman's seminary, in having "overlooked" his training in the psychology of service music, has denied him additional power of conception and discernment, of interpretation of his religious service and of influence in the pew. Music of the right kind is the greatest friend and assistant the clergyman can possibly have in his endeavor to reach the congregation with his message, and the clergyman who understands and has an intelligent grasp of real service music, is not of those who would destroy this efficient co-worker. The Church has been able to see that music at its

very best is something more than music, that certain music in its purity and genuineness, delicately handled, can stimulate and accentuate religious thought and purpose, and the Church has respected this mysterious power so much that it has provided for music a prominent responsibility in its church services. It is a serious responsibility—and an organist is required as the psychologist, one who can reach the pew with this influence, toward winning the pew's response to the service.

One of the most prominent organists in this country is often nauseated by the strain of the service. He vitalizes his music that it may serve, even at physical expense to himself. Believe it, he is not out in front of his music wondering if the congregation appreciates his prowess as a performer. Bless 'im, he is hidden away inside his lovely instrument, out of sight and mind, that his music may live in the pew as influence unobstructed. I have learned by observation a great deal from him. Some of his Postludes, for example, were triumphant in character, yet he seemed possessed by the conviction that it was not always necessary to turn on the full organ and blow people out of church. His soft Postlude, often with harp and violin, was very effective, fading away finally into impressive silence. The congregation remained for this Postlude, tip-toeing out in the silence which followed. It was atmosphere which followed to the very doors, and it was atmosphere which but emphasized the service. In this connection we organists might ask ourselves if we do not ourselves teach disrespect, if we do not ourselves further a lack of public interest in organ recitals, by using the lovely organ and its music to cover up congregational confusion before and after services. If it were known, we rob Silence of one of its great opportunities. There would seem something wrong with a service which cannot choke gossip and clatter at its close. I know the loud organ is expected to drown out this clatter (or is it a contest?), but why should the organ be forced to share a congregation's apparent disrespect for the service just closed? Is it the congregation, or the service, that is at fault? My own belief is that the fault lies in the service. If the service is real it is of holy things and it is impressive, and I

cannot conceive of gossip-y conversation in such atmosphere. The war has helped to sober us tremendously, and we are not using the church for drawing-room purposes, particularly just after a religious service.

A church is erected for one specific object. Services are held in it to further that same specific object. Persons who are capable of furthering that object are engaged as participants in that service and are given material with which to work—toward the end that the congregation may be influenced, may receive that for which it came to church. There are two principal participants as leaders in that service—the clergyman and the organist; both of them have their material with which to work. The clergyman has his material at hand, and the organist's material is over against the end of the building, but both participants are hand in hand, straining in their co-operative effort to obtain uplifting results in the nave.

Would you contradict me and say that the organist's occupation is to furnish *music?* Would you say that the service is but a pill of obligation, music supplying a sugar coating? Would you say that the organist is simply a hired man, hired to perform on musical instruments while the clergyman takes a rest? I am sure not. I do not mean that the organist should wear a white necktie and be versed in theology and exegesis; his refined, reverential music supplies his need. He ministers psychologically—and he must be equal both to his ministry and his psychology; he cannot possibly regard himself as above his music, nor his music above or apart from the service. I think you will agree with me that a text or thought can be interpreted and driven home by music when the spoken word may fail. And withal, the hammer is of less importance than the effect which the nail produces. End rather than means, effect more than cause. Music is means, cause, rather than end in a church service, else it has no right therein.

By this you will see how delicate the organist's material, and how carefully it must be handled; the training of the physical instrumentalist is hopeless in such limitations. You can also see clearly that this material does not exist for itself. Church

music is not for the ear; it is for the purpose of carrying, interpreting, expressing a religious thought for other people. It is not something "over at the end of the building" to which the congregation may listen. Quite to the contrary, real service music lives in the pew; influencing, persuading, aiding the clergyman in his effort to create response to the service. In earlier days the sermon was the service, but now the service is the service; a service by the people and for the people, a service of worship—and the clergyman feels the need of qualifying in his responsibility to the people. And in that need he should be able and free to draw upon music as an aid—and we are going to refine music in general use to the point of psychological application, that he may not draw in vain. The war has helped to teach the pew its own shortcomings, and the pew is to look to the chancel for further enlightenment and support. The chancel must therefore be high above a physical standard, one which the pew recognizes in respect and reverence, or fail of its purpose. Wherever it has existed, the chancel absorbed in "correct" procedure, dictation, must give way to the chancel inspirational in spiritual impulsion. Religious expression is to be on a much higher plane, and the mechanical or perfunctory, as well as the physical, is of the past. "Organization" has been overdone. We have heard too much of formula, of institution, of square corners and rigidity; too much emphasis placed upon organization and machinery. Organization is but the starting point. We are to hear of the church service more and more in terms of atmosphere; less of the materialistic, altogether the spiritual. Nor is there a suggestion of the perpendicular in the service alive with spiritual atmosphere. We shall lay stress upon first things; more upon message delivered, less upon message delivery. In one church the service is severe and exact. In another the same service is warm and inspiring. Similar in type, but differing in character—purely a difference of atmosphere, of personality. Changes and alterations in type do not assure us of beneficent results. The same rule applies in service music. Two choirs use the same anthem. In one case it is professionalism, physical music; in the other it is a part of the

service. The same anthem, but reaching the pew in contrasting interpretation. The war has greatly intensified our study of the church service, in the direction of greater power. We all are eagerly and earnestly scrutinizing and analyzing the service, lifting it in order that religious expression may without question be the expression of religion. We may confidently assume that the service will be on the transcendental list at the coming Convention at Detroit, the subject of constructive criticism. For revision of the Prayer Book, changes in rubrics, Sacrament ministrations—all must reflect themselves and center in the *power* of the church service. Thus comes refinement in process of development, to elevate our standards in the service and all its relationships—music included. The war has resulted in a greater respect for religion, in a larger realization of what religion means. Men now want the real thing; they will not have church music which is not the expression of religious thought. The clergyman can no longer, if ever, be simply the orator of flowery phrases, and the choir can no longer be simply a group of paid singers, their interest limited to a composition in music and its performance. The clergyman can no longer simply read out of a book; he must now make that book live. He can no longer be the preacher who simply says things in grandiose language; he must now be able to reach his congregation and bring response. He cannot be simply the mouthpiece; he can make good only by digging out his congregation and lifting it. Apply this need to music of the service, similarly hit, and you will realize what a task real church music has ahead of it in the coming days of greater intensity and greater reality. Organists are to be dealers in atmosphere, not music, and that atmosphere will be one of religious devotion, not of physical music.

We organists need not feel depressed over the situation. Indeed, we may feel elated; the position of the church organist is to be greatly enlarged and broadened. We must be sure we recognize the larger opportunity and that we are prepared, trained, for it. We should, first of all, recognize the truth that as contributors, participants, we are attached to something larger than ourselves and that we are not running a little insti-

tution of our own on the side. The clergyman must prove his ability to reach the individual in the pew, and the music must reach the same spot by the same method and with the same purpose—and in collaboration. The time when our music may have been "La, la, la," pretty music, entertaining music, and music which gave opportunity for individual display at the expense of the service, is gone. Each organist and each singer participating in a religious service must be willing to submerge self, obliterate individualism, and be an actual integral part of the material by which a critical congregation is to be taught, to be guided in things spiritual.

Thus will correction be applied—but correction which is far removed from extermination. Music is something far above us all, infinite, mysterious — a willing, generous, sympathetic servant. In its very nature, music is sympathy, just as a church service itself is sympathy. If you say that music cannot serve the service, that music simply is, I can reply that music even serves rhythm. No, church music's handicap is the person who would use it for personal aggrandizement, for ulterior purpose.

Music is a wonderful and powerful asset in the church service, out of which the most should be made. Music as application, atmosphere the censor, psychology supreme. Reducing music to a congregational basis is, to my mind, a real reduction, resulting in an impoverished service. I am confident in my belief that musical atmosphere of the right type can be more inspirational in the pew than the spoken word spoken by the pew. It is not often so, but it can be; all of which argues that advocacy of reduction is not constructive. We do not desire to reduce religion; we correct the expression of it—and if we will apply this to music we shall recognize the injustice involved in such reduction. Correction is coming, but it will consist of correction in the handling of music, music thus released, not reduced, and music free to exert its benign, natural influence. I have every respect for music as music, music as an art, but my respect lifts itself to awe when I learn that music of this certain type can console, nay more, it can strengthen and uplift the very inner soul of man. Music the lovely art has its use and value in our lives,

certainly, but music as influence in religious purpose and endeavor is of the infinite. Music in this greater sphere of influence and atmosphere loses its identity as music and becomes the mediator. Art is insufficient in the church service, else this present wave of adverse criticism would not be upon us. No, music as music has its use, but that use is not in the church service. Horatio Parker says there is no such thing as "sacred music." This may or may not be true, but if founded upon truth, then is there greater security in the belief that church music is in what it does, and not in what it is. Church music is no more of itself than are books, human beings, or churches of beautiful architecture. And when we learn to know service music in texture and application, when we learn to understand and appreciate, then will service music be free, obedient, glorified, flooding the service with a happy sunshine of encouragement, existing that it may serve. The strength of the liturgical service has accumulated its power through the ages. In this service, music has its inseparable part; for religious needs and aspirations cannot be articulated fully in words. There must be an outlet through which the inexpressible can be released—and with the "sweet singer of Israel" man has found this in music. He has passed through many, many changes, but he always has expressed his belief, his personal, intimate communion with God, through music—and doubtless he always will. The Bible rings with message clothed in the inspiration of music. Music, the instinctive, the infinite, encouraging man's response to the demands made by his higher nature in obedience to God's eternal law!

"Angel voices, ever ringing Round Thy throne of light;
Angel harps, forever ringing, Rest not day nor night."

Boston Public Library
Central Library, Copley Square

Division of
Reference and Research Services

Music Department

The Date Due Card in the pocket indicates the date on or before which this book should be returned to the Library.

Please do not remove cards from this pocket.

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 9999 08740 666 4